

Remarks

In the present response, claims 1 – 23 are presented for examination. Claims 21-23 are newly added.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-12, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,839,747 (Blumenau) in view of Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). These rejections are traversed.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-12, and 17-19 recite one or more elements that are not taught or suggested in Blumenau in view of AAPA. These missing elements show that the differences between the combined teachings in the art and the recitations in the claims are great. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art. Some examples are provided below for independent claim 1.

As an example, claim 1 recites that the GUI receives “user input to grant and deny access permissions for hosts to both the data access drives and to the transfer robotics.” In other words, the user can utilize the GUI to grant and deny access permissions to both the access drives and the transfer robotics (i.e., picker) for the hosts. This element is not taught or suggested in Blumenau in view of AAPA.

Paragraph [0003] in AAPA states that “users may be given access to one or more data access drives, for read and/or write operations, and to transfer robotics to move the storage media between storage cells and the data access drives.” This paragraph teaches that a user can use drives and transfer robotics for performing read and write operations to storage media. This paragraph, however, never suggests that this user can control access permissions to the drives and transfer robotics. In other words, AAPA merely teaches providing access to or using data access drives and transfer robotics. No teaching is provided that a user can grant and deny access permissions to both the drives and the transfer robotics.

Blumenau teaches a GUI that allows a user to modify the topology of a network and availability of storage volumes assigned to hosts. Although Blumenau teaches modifying the topology, **Blumenau does not teach modifying host permissions to specific drives and transfer robotics**. Blumenau does not offer this level of finite

control in the storage area network. Blumenau explains the type of control and access a user has with the GUI:

In one embodiment of the present invention, a graphical user interface (GUI) is provided with which a user can graphically view the availability and assignment of data storage volumes to different hosts in a storage network. The GUI also allows a user to graphically view the topology of the network (i.e., how network devices such as hosts, HBAs, storage systems, storage system adapters, etc., are interconnected in the network), and to graphically modify the topology of the network and/or the availability and assignment of storage volumes to different hosts in the network. Advantageously, the GUI permits network devices and the availability and assignment of storage volumes on a storage system to be viewed, managed, and modified.

Blumenau teaches a GUI that allows a user to modify the topology of the network and availability of storage volumes assigned to hosts. By contrast, claim 1 recites that the GUI receives user input to grant and deny access permissions “for hosts to both the data access drives and to the transfer robotics” So, although Blumenau teaches modifying the topology, Blumenau does not teach modifying host permissions to both drives and transfer robotics.

Claim 1 recites a level of control that includes both drives and transfer robots. This level of finite control provides the system administrator with significant advantage since workloads and storage assignments can be altered between not only the larger storage volumes but also the smaller sub-components, namely the drives and pickers. This level of control was not known in the art before Applicants’ invention.

For at least these reasons, the claims are allowable over Blumenau in view of AAPA.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 13-16 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,839,747 (Blumenau) in view of Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA), USPN 6,212,606 (Dimitroff), and US publication number 2004/0032430 (Yung). These rejections are traversed.

As explained above, Blumenau in view of AAPA fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of the independent claims. Dimitroff and Yung fail to cure these deficiencies. For at least these reasons, dependent claims 13-16 and 19-20 are allowable over Blumenau in view of AAPA, Dimitroff, and Yung.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529